A

TRACT

Concerning the

SIN

Against the

Holy Ghost.

By the ever Memorable

Mr. *JOHN HALES*,

of *Eton Colledge*, &c.

LONDON,

Printed for *John Blyth*, at Mr *Playfords* Shop in the *Temple*, 1677.

A TRACT concerning the SIN againſt the HOLY GHOST.

MAny have Written of the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and in defining or deſcribing of it, follow their own zealous conceits, and not the Canon of Holy Scriptures. The more dreadful the Sin is, the more fearful we muſt be, in charging it upon any ſpecial crime, or particular perſon. In defining a ſin of ſo heynous a nature, direct and evident proof

from Scripture is requiſite. It is not enough to conſider, (as many do) what ſins are moſt deſperate and deadly, and therefore to conclude ſuch ſins are againſt the Holy Ghoſt. Thus indeed the Schoolmen have done, who have made ſix differences of this ſin, v. in fine. without any ground or warrant from Scripture for ſo doing. And *Bellarmine* is ſo liberal in beſtowing on ſuch as he calls Hereticks, that his opinion is, that a Man can ſcarce be a learned Proteſtant, without committing the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt. Neither are the Papiſts the only Men that are miſtaken about this ſin: but too many Divines of the Reformed Churches, have ſtarted aſide from the Scripture, and have given us ſuch intricate and contradictory

dictory definitions of this sin, as tend only to the perplexing the tender Consciences of weak Christians. To make good this Censure, I will briefly set down so much touching this sin, as I conceive is warranted by the Word of God, and humbly submit to the judgment of the Learned.

The Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, was an evil speaking of, or slandering of the Miracles which our Saviour did, by those, who though they were convinced by the Miracles, to believe that such Works could not be done, but by the power of God, yet they did malitiously say, they were wrought by the power of the Devil.

In this Definition, these points are observable.

1. I forbear to call it the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, but the Blaſphemy; for though every Blaſphemy be a ſin in general, yet our Saviour Chriſt, terms it the Blaſphemy. And the Evangeliſts do all agree, to give it the ſame term: and 'tis now here in holy Scripture called the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt; and yet it appears both in *St. Mathew* and *St. Mark*, that there was juſt occaſion offered to our Saviour to call it ſo; where he compares it with the ſin againſt the Son of Man; but he forbears to call it any thing, but the Blaſphemy; thereby, no doubt, to teach us, it conſiſteth only in curſed ſpeaking and Blaſpheming. A ſerious conſideration of this point, may teach us ſo much moderation, as to confine

confine our ſelves to that term which our Saviour in the three Evangeliſts hath preſcribed unto us. I cannot find that any Man that hath writ upon this Argument, hath made any obſervation, or noted this phraſe and term uſed by the Evangeliſts, in pronouncing the dreadful ſentence of our Saviour againſt the Blaſphemy of the Holy Ghoſt, I will cite theſe Texts, where it is named, *Math.* 12. 31. *Mark* 3. 28 *Luke* 12 10.

2. A ſecond Obſervation is, That Blaſphemy is a ſpeaking againſt another, as both *St. Matthew* and *St. Luke* expound the word, for in the Original, it is a blaſting the Fame, or *blaming* of another; for from the Greek word Βλασφημέω both the *French*

Nation and our *Engliſh* by contraction have made the word blame.

3. To paſs from the Name to the Thing it ſelf, we may obſerve by the coherence of the Texts, that Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, was ſpoken of by our Saviour, concerning the Scribes and Phariſees. It was (ſaith *S. Mark*) becauſe the Phariſees ſaid, he had an unclean ſpirit, and that he caſt out Devils by *Belzebub*, *&c.* This ſpeech of the Phariſees, whereby they ſlandered his Miracles, wrought by the power of the Holy Ghoſt, is properly the Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt. How tranſcendent a crime it was, to traduce that power by which our Saviour wrought his Miracles, may appear

pear, from the end for which theſe Miracles were wrought; which was, to prove to the people that ſaw them, that he was the *Meſſias*; which is evident from the places of Scripture, wherein he appealed to his works, 10 *Joh.* 37. 38. 14. *Joh.* 11. 11 *Math.* 4. 4. *Joh.* 29. Theſe and other places ſhew, that the working of Miracles, was an act of the moſt glorious manifeſtation of the power of God, by which at the firſt view, the ſimpleſt people were led by their outward ſenſe, to the great myſtery of inward Faith in Chriſt their Redeemer.

Therefore, for thoſe men that were eye-witneſſes of thoſe Miracles which did make them know that Chriſt was a Teacher come from

from God, to Blaſpheme that power, by which theſe Miracles were wrought, and to ſay they were done by the help of the Devil, was the moſt ſpightful and malicious ſlander that could be invented; for thereby they attempted, as much as in them lay, to deſtroy the very principles of Faith, and to prevent the very firſt propagation of the Goſpel, to the univerſal miſchief of all Mankind. And though theſe Phariſees were no Chriſtians, and therefore could not fall away from faith, which they never had, yet they did know and believe that Chriſt was a Teacher come from God; for ſo our Saviour tells them, 7 *Joh.* 28. Ye both know me, and whence I am. They did not believe him as a Saviour,

but

but as a great Prophet from God; (as the *Mahometans* do at this very day) they truſted to be ſaved by their Law, and becauſe he taught ſuch things as did abrogate their Law, in which they ſo much gloried, they were ſo malicious to his Doctrine, which they did not believe, that they ſpoke evil of his Miracles which they did believe; leaſt the people by approving his Miracles, ſhould believe his Doctrine.

4. Obſerve, that its ſaid to be Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, becauſe, by the Holy Ghoſt, the Miracles were wrought *Math.* 12 28. 1 *Cor* 12. 10.

5. The Blaſphemy againſt the Son of Man was, when men conſidered Chriſt as a mere man, and did diſgracefully tax his converſation,

versation, by saying, behold a glutton, a bibber of Wine, a friend to Publicans and sinners. But the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, was, when Men beholding Christs Miracles, did enviously ascribe them to the Devil, which they knew and believed to be done by Gods power.

6. The Texts formerly cited out of the three Evangelists, being all the places wherein the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is named; we cannot find by them, that we have any safe rule to conclude, that any but the Scribes and Pharisees, and their confederates, committed that sin. I dare not say, that *Judas*, *Julian* the Apostate, or *Simon Magus*, or those that stoned *Stephen*, were guilty thereof.

7. The

7. The Apostles have not in any of their Epistles once mentioned this Blasphemy, and yet they were most careful and frequent in exhortations from all sorts of sin: It were much therefore if they should omit or forget such a fearful crime, without often and precise admonishing to beware of it. And though negative proofs from Scripture, are not demonstrative, yet the general silence of the Apostles, may at least help to infer a probability, that the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, is not committable by any Christian, which lived not in the time of our Saviour. As for those Texts in the sixth and tenth Chapter to the *Hebrews*, and in 1 *John* 5. 16. (which by late Divines are expoun-

expounded of the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt) I do not find that the Ancient Fathers did ſo underſtand them, excepting only *St. Auſtine*, who ſo interprets that one place in *St. John*, that all men confeſs him to be in an error. There be three Texts in the Epiſtles, wherein although the Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt be not named, yet, moſt think, it is intended and meant. And *Bellarmine* confuting *St. Auſtin*'s opinion, who held, that final impenitency was the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt) affirms, that it ſeems the three Texts in the Epiſtles, are ſpoken of that ſin; and yet this great Cardinal forgetting what he had ſaid in the ſame Chapter contradicts himſelf, and ſhews how that thoſe three

three places are not to be interpreted of that ſin. I will cite the Texts, and then his interpretation of them, according to the expoſition of *St. Ambroſe*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Hierom*, and other Fathers, as he ſaith.

The firſt is *Heb. 6.* It is impoſſible, *&c.* The Apoſtle here ſpeaks only of Repentance, which did go before Baptiſme, for ſo *Chryſoſtome* and *Ambroſe*, *&c.* expound it; which the Apoſtle intimates in theſe words. Which were once enlightened, that is, Baptized, for anciently, to be illuminated, ſignified to be Baptized. Secondly, in theſe words (to renew again) for we are properly renewed in Baptiſme. Thirdly, in theſe (crucifying the Son of God afreſh) for when

when we are Baptized, we are conformed to the likeneſs of his death, 6 *Rom.* And as Chriſt was only once crucified, ſo alſo we are only once Baptized; and he that will be again Baptized, ſhould again crucifie to himſelf Chriſt. Let me add this, that in the verſes next before this Text, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the foundation of Repentance, and the Doctrine of Baptiſme. And in this Text, our new Tranſlation followeth *Beza* (who hath varied from the Original, by putting the conditional *Si*, *If*, inſtead of the Copulative *Et*, *And*, and by adding the Cauſal *Ut*) ſo that whereas *Beza* and our Tranſlation is, *ſi prolabantur ut crucifigant*, The Greek, and vulgar Latine is, καὶ παραπεσόντας ἀναςαυρῶσαι, *prolapſi ſunt*

ſunt crucifigentes; for the word doth not ſignify to fall away, but to fall caſually or negligently, ſo παράπτωμα *Galat* 6. is tranſlated fault, but not falling away.

The ſecond Text is, *Hebrews* 10. 26. For if we ſin willingly or wilfully, after we have received the knowledge of the Truth, there remains no more ſacrifice for ſin. Anſwer, I ſay with *Chryſoſtom*, *Ambroſe*, and other Fathers; The ſence is, we muſt not expect another Chriſt to dye for us, or that he that dyed once, ſhould come again to dye for us.

The third Text, 1 *Joh* 5. 16. There is a ſin unto death: I do not ſay ye ſhall pray for it; *St. Hierom* ſaith, that nothing elſe is here meant, but that a Prayer for a ſin unto death, is very hard-

ly or difficultly heard; and this ſeems to be the trueſt ſenſe of this place: for *St. John* ſaith, in the verſe immediately before, we know we have the Petitions we deſire of him; therefore leaſt we ſhould think this to hold true in all Petitions even for others, he adds, if any Man ſee his Brother ſin a ſin, which is not unto death, he ſhall ask, *&c.* he ſhall ask, that is, let him ask with confidence, for he ſhall obtain; but if it be a ſin unto death, that is, a great ſin, ſuch an one as is not ordinarily pardoned, but puniſhed with death: I do not ſay, ye ſhall pray for it, that is I dare not promiſe that you ſhall eaſily obtain, and therefore I do not ſay that you ſhall pray for it, that is, with that confidence of obtaining;

ing;for often in ſuch caſes, God doth nothear the Prayers of his Saints;as God ſaith, *Jer.* 7. 16. If theſe expoſitions upon the former Texts be found; the Definition of the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, cannot be grounded upon all or any of them:for as it is not nameed, ſo it is not meant in any of them; but if they ſeem to any to be unſound, let him bring better and more agreeable to the literal meaning and ſence, coherence and ſcope of the Text, and I ſhall gladly learn. It ſeems a probable expoſition of the firſt place, *Heb.* 6. that a learned Divine, who produceth this Text for proof of his definition of the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, doth confeſs againſt himſelf, that the Apoſtle in this place denieth a ſe-

cond Baptiſme, where he ſpeaketh of Repentance, becauſe they are mentioned together in the ſame place, and have ſome affinity and correſpondence. As for the ſecond Text, *Heb.* 10. I muſt ſay, that if *St. Paul* in this place, meant the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, that then this were the only deſperate Text in the whole Bible, for what Man is there that ſins not willingly; for ſo the word ἑκουσίως properly ſignifies: *Beza* tranſlates it *ultrò*, the vulgar Latine, *voluntariè*, or willingly, not wilfully, or obſtinately. It is but a miſerable ſhift, when *St. Paul* ſaith, if we ſin willingly, for Mr *Calvin* to tell us, that the Text doth not mean every willing ſin, but only a malitious reſiſting of the Truth. Could

Could not *St. Paul*, as eaſily as Mr *Calvin*, have ſaid, If we ſin malitiouſly, as ſay, if we ſin willingly? My comfort is, that if the Text be adviſedly conſidered, there is no ſuch thing as the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, or any other deſperate concluſion, to be found in the Text; the ſcope of the precedent verſes do evidently expound the Apoſtles meaning to be this, to let the *Jews* know, that the caſe was not now with them, as it was under the Law; for under the Law they had daily ſacrifice for ſin, but now under the Goſpel they had but one ſacrifice, once for all; every Prieſt ſtandeth daily miniſtring and offering often times the ſame ſacrifice, but this Man after he had offered one

ſacrifice, for ever ſate down at the right hand of God, as it is, verſe 11. of that Chapter, which may ſerve for a comment upon the Verſe now in queſtion. And it is worth our noting, that the Text doth not ſay, if we ſin wilfully, there is no ſacrifice for ſin; this had been an hard ſaying indeed; but the words are, there remains no more ſacrifice for ſin: there is ſome comfortable difference, I hope, between theſe two propoſitions; there is no ſacrifice, and there remains no more ſacrafice for ſin: So that if we do not believe in that one ſacrifice, as ſufficient, but look every day for ſome new ſacrifice for every new ſin, we muſt expect nothing but judgment.

As to the third place, 1 *Joh.* 5. 16.

5. 16. many would conclude, there is a ſin for which we may not pray; Firſt, becauſe it is irremiſſable, and this they think muſt needs be the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, meant by *St. John*, Their beſt argument is, *John's* not ſaying we ſhould pray, is a ſaying we ſhould not pray; his ſilence to them is prohibition. This is bad Grammar, and worſe Logick. For we find, that *St. Stephen* prayed for them that ſtoned him, and yet told them they reſiſted the Holy Ghoſt. And *St. Peter* exhorted *Simon Magus* to Repentance, and yet both he and thoſe that ſtoned *Stephen*, are commonly reputed ſinners againſt the Holy Ghoſt. *St. Ambroſe* is of that charitable opinion, that he thinks the ſin againſt the

Holy Ghoſt may be pardoned by Repentance, becauſe the people of the *Jews*, that had ſaid of Chriſt, that he caſt out Devils by *Belzebub*, afterwards at the preaching of *St. Peter*, are ſaid to be converted, *Acts* 2. *St. Auſtine* in a Retract concludes, we muſt deſpair of no Man, no not of the wickedeſt, as long as he liveth; and we ſafely pray for him, of whom we don't deſpair. For though it be expreſly ſaid, That the Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhall not be forgiven, yet theſe words may juſtly receive a qualification, if we will but allow the ſame mitigation of theſe words, which all Men confeſs we muſt needs allow to the precedent words in the ſame verſe, to which theſe have relation; where

it

it is ſaid generally, all Sins, and all Blaſphemies ſhall be forgiven, it cannot be meant of all ſins always, and to all Men, for then no ſin could be damnable, but the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, which is moſt falſe; and therefore the meaning muſt be, all ſins ſhall be forgiven ordinarily, and for the moſt part; ſo on the contrary, Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhall not ordinarily, but hardly be forgiven. Even thoſe who are moſt ſtrict to maintain the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, to be unpardonable, will yet acknowledge, that ſometimes in Scripture, Impoſſibility is uſed to note a difficulty, and thoſe things are ſpoken indefinitely to all, which belong but to a part only. Thus the difficulty of a rich

rich Mans entering into the Kingdome of Heaven, is presented to us by our Saviour, under the similitude of an impossibility.

Having dispatch'd these Texts of Scripture which do either name, or are thought to concern, the sin against the Holy Ghost, it remains to examine those common Definitions of this sin which are now current; though different in the terms by which they define it; some call it a total or final falling away from faith, or a wilful Apostacy, or a malicious resisting of the truth; yet when they come to explain their meaning, the difference among them is not considerable. I shall chiefly apply my self to Mr *Calvin's* definition, because his judgment hath gained

ed the greateſt reputation among the multitude; as alſo, for that he himſelf promiſes ſuch a true definition, as ſhall eaſily, by it ſelf overthrow all the reſt. In his *Inſtitut. Lib.* 2. *Chap.* 3. he ſaith, they ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, *Qui divinæ veritati (cujus fulgore ſic perſtringuntur ut ignorantiam cauſari nequeunt) tamen deſtinata malitia reſiſtunt, in hoc tantum, ut reſiſtant.* *Arminius* alſo uſeth Mr *Calvins* words. The Rhetorical Parentheſis, which might well have been ſpared in a definition, being reduced to plain and brief terms; this definition of *Calvin* may be thus Engliſhed, They ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, who of determined malice, reſiſt the known Truth of God, to the end only to reſiſt. In this

Mr

Mr *Calvin* doth not define what the ſin is, but who they are that commit it; whereas by the Rules of Logick, *Concretes* admit of no definition, but only *Abſtracts*. But taking the definition as it is, it conſiſts principally upon theſe three terms. Firſt, Truth; Secondly, Known; Thirdly, Reſiſted; or a reſiſting of the known Truth. The words being general and doubtful, we will conſider them ſingly.

Firſt, If by the truth Mr *Calvin* underſtands the Word of God, or the whole Doctrine revealed in the Scriptures, then the ſenſe of this Term will be too large: for even the Phariſees which ſpoke againſt the Holy Ghoſt, did not reſiſt the whole Truth of God in the Scripture, for

for they believed in the Law of *Moſes*, and had confidence to be ſaved by the keeping of it. And in defence of that Law, (as they thought) they did Blaſpheme the Holy Ghoſt. Therefore properly by the Truth of God, Mr *Calvin* muſt confine his meaning to the Truth of the Goſpel or Doctrine of Faith, for ſo both he himſelf and others expound themſelves, by terming the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, a falling away, or turning away from Faith, or Apoſtacy.

Secondly, By this word Known, Mr *Calvin* muſt mean belief, for Faith is properly by believing, not knowing the truth.

Thirdly, The Word, Reſiſting, muſt mean unbelieving: for if receiving of the Truth be by be-

belief, then Reſiſting of the Truth muſt bely unbelief. And indeed Mr. *Calvin* explains himſelf in the ſame Chapter, ſaying, there is no place for pardon where knowledge is joyned with unbelief, *Non eſſe veniæ locum*, *&c.* So then by this definition, to reſiſt the known Truth, is all one, as if Mr *Calvin* had ſaid in proper terms, for a Man at once to unbelieve that which he doth believe; which two things it is impoſſible to do together? and if they be not together, there can be no reſiſtance. It is true, that for ſome reaſons, a Man may be brought, not to believe that which he formerly believed. This cannotbe in an inſtant, but ſucceſſively unbelief comes in the place of belief. And this

may

may not be called a reſiſting, for that all reſiſtance conſiſts in a violence between two at the leaſt; but where two ſucceed one another, and are never together, it cannot poſſibly be. I confeſs a Man may reſiſt the Truth, when it is a Truth, in it ſelf only, or in the underſtanding of ſome other; but to reſiſt the Truth which is known, and believed by the reſiſter himſelf, is a direct contradiction; for the nature of Truth is ſuch, that if the underſtanding apprehend it for Truth, it cannot but aſſent unto it. No Man can force himſelf to believe what he liſts, or when he liſts. Sometimes a Man knows not what to believe, but finds a ſuſpenſion of his Faith, or trepidation

tion of his understanding, not knowing which way to turn. This cannot be called a resisting of the Truth, when the Truth is not known, but doubted of. Again, some Truths there be, though they be assented to by the understanding for Truths, yet they are not desired as good; for truth is one degree nearer the Soul of Man than goodness. The Pharisees did apprehend the Miracles of our Saviour as true, but not as good; because they tended to the derogation of their Law, which they esteemed a better Truth.° And for this cause, they Blasphemed that Truth, which in their hearts they believed for Truth. For the truth of words, or speech, is, (as the Schools say) nothing else but the sign

ſign of truth, not truth it ſelf; for truth it ſelf is ſeated in the underſtanding, and not in the ſpeech. That Truth which the underſtanding aſſents to, the ſpeech may affirm to be falſe; there are many things believed in deed, which are denied in word: but ſuch a denial is not reſiſting, but only making ſhew of reſiſting, the Truth; for reſiſtance muſt be in the ſame place where Truth is; Truth being ſeated in the underſtanding, reſiſtance muſt be placed there alſo; the underſtanding can reſiſt no Truth, but by unbelieving of it. If Mr *Calvin* had intended of the Truth only in word, he had come one ſtep nearer to the Truth of Scripture, but he was not ſo happy in the expreſſion of

his meaning: nay his terms of Incredulity, Apostacy, falling away, &c. relate to a real, not verbal, Apostacy, and Unbelief. It remains then to my understanding, that Mr *Calvin* makes the resistance of the Truth to be a not believing of what we do believe; which being a contradiction, he defines the Sin against the Holy Ghost, to be such a Sin, as no Man possibly can commit. And yet in the other extream, in expounding his own definition, he makes it such a Sin, as no Man living but commits; for by his Doctrine, (as I take it) any Sin may be the Sin against the Holy Ghost. His words are these, *Quorum convicta est conscientia verbum Dei esse quod repudiant & impugnant, impugnare*

pugnare tamen non deſiſtant, illi in ſpiritum blaſphemari dicuntur. What Man is there that doth not daily, in ſome Point or other, forſake the word of God, and ceaſes not to impugne it, and is convinced thereof in his Conſcience: I know Mr *Calvin* was far from thinking, that *St. Paul*, did Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and yet *St. Paul* it ſeems was convinced in his Conſcience, that it was the Word of God he fought againſt, and yet ceaſed not to fight againſt it, when he ſaith, he delighted in the Law of God, yet another Law warring againſt the Law of his mind, brought him into Captivity of the Law of Sin. What dangerous conſequences weak Conſciences may draw to themſelves,

out of this unbridled, unlimited propoſition of Mr *Calvins*, let others judge. There is a juſt cauſe I preſume to except againſt Mr *Calvin*, and all others, who in this concurr with him, to omit the term of Blaſphemy in their definitions; for this is perpetually obſerved by our Saviour in his ſpeech concerning this Sin, by the Evangeliſts with one conſent: but inſtead of the word Blaſphemy, he hath brought in the word, reſiſt, for a Genus of this Sin; but by what Authority I know not; I cannot find it, or the equivalent to it, in any of theſe places, which are thought to touch this Sin I find only falling away mentioned, *Heb.* 6. which phraſe is uſed by Mr *Calvin*, for reſiſting; whereas falling

ling away, and reſiſting, are no more alike, than fighting and runing away, which are little leſs than contraries. The laſt point I ſhall touch in Mr *Calvins* definition, is, where he ſaith, the Sinners againſt the Holy Ghoſt reſiſt, to the end only that they may reſiſt; and yet withall he tells, they reſiſt out of a determinate malice. If they reſiſt out of malice, then the end for which they reſiſt, is for the ſatisfaction of their malice. The Phariſees here condemned by our Saviour, had an other end than bare reſiſting. The defence of the Law of *Moſes*, was the end for which they Blaſphemed, and not any pleaſure they could have in the bare and ſimple act of reſiſtance. We find three old opini-

opinions, concerning the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, but they were long ſince exploded; I will but only name them. *Origen* thought, all Sins committed after Baptiſme, were Sins againſt the Holy Ghoſt: his reaſon was only a witleſs conceit of his own, That God the Father was in all things, the Son only in all reaſonable Creatures, the Holy Ghoſt in all regenerate Men. Therefore when Men Sin againſt the Divine Perſon, which is in them, if they be Heathen, they Sin againſtGod the Father,or Son; if they be Chriſtians, they Sin againſt God the Holy Goſt; but this opinion is falſe.The *Novatian* Hereticks agreed with *Origen* in opinion, for they denied remiſſion of Sins to any that fell,thinking

ing all falls of Chriſtians to be Sins againſt the Holy Ghoſt; but this opinion is falſe; elſe all Sins were unpardonable to Chriſtians. Yet we find *St. Paul*, to remit the Sins of the inceſtuous *Corinthian*.

Our Saviour alſo chargeth the Phariſees with this, who were no Chriſtians. *St. Auſtin* thought final impenitency to be the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt; but final impenitency is no Blaſphemy, but only a general circumſtance, that may accompany any Sin: beſides, our Saviour intends, that this Sin may be found in this life. And the Phariſees were alive when they were accuſed of it. *Pet. Lumbard*, and *Tho. Aquinas*, thought Sins of Malice, to be Sins againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and Sins of infirmity againſt the Father, and Sins of ignorance

norance against the Son. This opinion is false, because the Sin against the Holy Ghost, must be a Sin of some certain Blasphemy, but malice is no certain Sin, but a General, and 'tis not always a Blasphemy.

The six differences the Schoolmen make of the Sin against the Holy Ghost, are these;

1. Envying of our Brothers Graces; 2. Impugning of the Known Truth; 3. Desperation; 4. Obstinacy; 5. Presumption; 6. Final Impenitency

In this determination of the point of Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and the inquiry made into Mr *Calvins* and others new definition; I hope I have delivered nothing contrary to the Articles of the Church of *England*.

FINIS.